

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Project Lead: Katrina Leavitt
Field Office: Sierra Front Field Office
Lead Office: Sierra Front Field Office
Case File/Project Number: N/A
NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0014-DNA
Project Name: Temporary Water Haul Sites
Applicant Name: BLM
Project Location (County, Township/Range/Section[s]):

Grazing Allotment	Township, Range & Section	County
Adriance Valley	T16N, R24E Sec 29 T15N, R24E Sec 10, 22, 26 & 27 & 36 T16N, R25E Sec 31 T15N, R25E Sec 5, 8, 12, & 18	Lyon
Antelope Mountain	T23N, R19E, Sec 12, 13 & 14 T22N, R18E, Sec 36	Washoe
Artesia	T13N, R24E Sec 22	Lyon
Churchill Canyon	T22N, R18E, Sec 17 T14N, R24E Sec 6	Douglas & Lyon
Hallelujah Junction	T23N, R17E Sec 26 T22N, R17E Sec 1,3 & 12 T22N, R18E Sec 6 & 8	Lassen & Washoe
Hudson Hills	T13N, R24E Sec 28	Lyon
Lincoln Flat	T14N, R24E Sec 7 & 27	Lyon
Paiute	T22N, R20E Sec 6, 17 & 20	Washoe
Plumas Station	T22N, R17E Sec 25	Lassen
Spanish Springs / Mustang	T20N, R21 E Sec 25 T19N, R21E Sec 10	Washoe
Truckee-Virginia	T19N, R26E Sec 16 & 30 T18N, R25E Sec 14	Lyon & Churchill

A. Describe the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) declared a drought disaster for the state of Nevada. The declaration of drought disaster was affirmed by Nevada's Governor Brian Sandoval. In response to drought conditions water will be hauled to temporary water troughs to redistribute livestock use during drought conditions. Water haul areas could be used from 2014 until one growing season past the cessation of drought conditions. Water hauling would occur in 11 allotments. The number of water haul areas in any one allotment varies between one and 12. The total number of water haul areas is 42. See table below.

Allotment Name	Water Haul Number	Greater Sage-Grouse		Bi-State Sage-Grouse
		PPH	PGH	Proposed Critical Habitat
Adriance Valley	1	NA	NA	No
	2	NA	NA	No
	3	NA	NA	No
	4	NA	NA	No
	5	NA	NA	No
	6	NA	NA	No
	7	NA	NA	No
	8	NA	NA	No
	9	NA	NA	No
	10	NA	NA	No
	11	NA	NA	No
	12	NA	NA	No
Antelope Mountain	1	No	Yes	NA
	2	No	Yes	NA
	3	No	Yes	NA
	4	No	Yes	NA
	5	No	No	NA
Artesia	1	NA	NA	No
Churchill Canyon	1	NA	NA	Yes
	2	NA	NA	No
	3	NA	NA	No
Hallelujah Junction	1	No	No	NA
	2	No	No	NA
	3	No	No	NA
	4	No	No	NA
	5	No	No	NA
	6	No	No	NA
	7	No	No	NA
	8	No	No	NA
Hudson Hills	1	NA	NA	No
Lincoln Flat	1	NA	NA	No
	2	NA	NA	No
Paiute	1	No	No	NA
	2	No	No	NA
	3	No	No	NA
Plumas Station	1	No	No	NA
Spanish Springs / Mustang	1	No	No	NA
	2	No	No	NA
	3	No	No	NA

Truckee-Virginia	1	No	No	NA
	2	No	No	NA
	3	No	No	NA

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance:

The Proposed Action is in conformance within the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP sections:

Consolidated Resource Management Plan (May 2001): LSG - 1

- Maintain or improve the condition of the public rangelands to enhance productivity for all rangeland and watershed values;
- Provide adequate, high quality forage for livestock by improving rangeland condition;
- Maintain a sufficient quality and diversity of habitat and forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses through natural regeneration and/or vegetation manipulation methods;
- Improve the vegetation resource and range condition by providing for the physiological needs of the key plant species; and
- Reduce soil erosion and enhance watershed values by increasing ground cover and litter.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action:

Carson City District (CCD) Drought Management Environmental Assessment (Drought EA) (DOI-BLM-NV-C000-2013-0001-EA). The Finding of No Significant Impact statement was dated July 2, 2013.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new Proposed Action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in existing NEPA document(s)? If the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes. The Proposed Action is to implement Drought Response Actions (DRA) described in the CCD Drought Management Plan (Appendix 3 of the Drought EA) "I. Temporary Water Hauls."

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes, the current environmental concerns, interests and resource values are the same as analyzed in the Drought EA. Temporary water hauls for the duration of the drought plus one growing season to allow for resource protection are one of the DRAs described in the Drought Management Plan (Appendix 3 of the Drought EA) and analyzed in Drought EA (page 10). The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document for responding to drought conditions remains appropriate with respect to the current Proposed Action.

Since the completion of Drought EA in 2013, there are no new environmental concerns, interests, resource values or circumstances that have been introduced that would require additional analysis to be conducted in the area.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listing, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude the new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new Proposed Action?

Yes. The existing analysis covers the current drought conditions that have been documented. Temporary water hauls one of the DRAs described in the Proposed Action of the CCD Drought Management Plan (Appendix 3 of the Drought EA) and analyzed in the Drought EA (page 10). According to the U.S. Drought Monitor, the drought is forecasted to persist across northern Nevada. Given the continuation of the drought, the BLM can reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the potential impacts of the Proposed Action.

4. Are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new Proposed Action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes. The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects for the Proposed Action are identical to those identified in the Drought EA. The Drought EA sufficiently analyzed all affected resources related to implementing one or more drought response actions.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the new Proposed Action?

Yes. The public involvement and interagency review associated with Drought EA is adequate for the Proposed Action. Comments were accepted on the Drought EA for a 30-day period from March 12, 2013 through April 12, 2013. Postcards mailed to 147 individuals, organizations and agencies were mailed on March 12, 2013. Emails were sent to 10 individuals, organizations and agencies, and notification of the availability of the Drought EA was sent to 61 other State and federal agencies was made through the Nevada State Clearinghouse on March 14, 2013. The CCD published a news release on March 12, 2013. The also posted the Dear Reader Letter and CCD Drought EA on the project website on March 12, 2013.

All comments were reviewed, considered, and then categorized into topics when feasible. Distinct topics and comments are summarized in Appendix 7 of the Drought EA. During the comment period approximately 6,950 comment letters and emails were received from numerous individuals, State agencies, and non-governmental organizations by email, fax or mail. Organizations included the Sierra Club, the Cloud Foundation, and the American Wild Horse Preservation Campaign. State agencies that commented include the Nevada Division of Water Resources, the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Nevada State Grazing Board District N-3, and the Nevada Department of Wildlife. Minor non-substantive changes were made to the EA as a result of these comment letters.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Rachel Crews	Archeologist	BLM

Note: refer to the NEPA document(s) for a complete list of team members that participated in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning document(s).

Conclusion: Based on the review documented above, I have concluded that this Proposed Action conforms to the LUP and that existing NEPA document(s) fully cover the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.


Does this DNA constitute the decision document for this Proposed Action? ☐ Yes ☒ No (see attached proposed decision)



Signature of Project Lead



Signature of NEPA Coordinator



Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

DEC 17 2014